

REMARKS

Claims 1-45 have been rejected by the final Office Action mailed September 11, 2008, and the Advisory Action mailed November 18, 2008, the present amendment is being filed concurrently with a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) under 37 C.F.R. §1.114 and Petition for (One-Month) Extension of Time submitted contemporaneously herewith. After entry of the present amendment, Claims 1- 45 remain pending in the application. The present amendment amends independent claims 1, 9, 17, 27, and 37, to clarify the respective scope of the claimed inventions of claims 1, 9, 17, 27, and 37. Reconsideration of the application in view of the present amendment and following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

In the final Office Action, claims 1-45 were again rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Goeller, et al., U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/01788112 (“Goeller”). The present amendment amends independent claims 1, 9, and 17 to clarify that the claimed invention of claims 1, 9, and 17, can include “a plurality of user selectable identifiers associated with the merchant, wherein each of the plurality of user selectable identifiers is assigned to at least one selected type of check transaction and wherein each of the plurality of user selectable identifiers is predefined by the merchant prior to electronically processing the check”. (Underlining supplied). Claims 27 and 37 have been similarly amended. These amendments are fully supported by the Applicants’ specification in at least, for example, paragraphs [0157] through [0163], which state in part:

FIG. 11 illustrates a specific example where each the four exemplary identifiers are assigned to preferentially handle selected types of check transactions. The "preferential handling" may be facilitated by a single POS device wherein a default set of options are loaded into the device upon the selection of the identifier. The single POS device may still allow other functions (not associated with the selected configuration) to be performed via one or more menus. The preferential configuration may also be implemented via a plurality of POS devices associated with the merchant, with each device having similar

default set of preferred options and other selectable functions. (See paragraph [0158]).

Thus in the exemplary configuration of FIG. 11, merchant A is depicted as having the exemplary identifier ID1 (494a) associated with configuration A1 that preferentially handles face-to-face checks (as indicated by arrow 506a). Similarly, the ID2 (494b) is associated with configuration A2 that preferentially handles both face-to-face and non-face-to-face checks (as indicated by arrow 506b). The ID3 (494c) is associated with configuration A3 that preferentially handles non-face-to-face checks (as indicated by arrow 506c). The ID4 (494d) is associated with configuration A4 that preferentially handles non-face-to-face checks having common check amounts (as indicated by arrow 506d). As previously described, these exemplary preferred configurations can be implemented via one or more POS devices. (See paragraph [0159]).

In FIG. 12A, a process 520 obtains a merchant identifier via a menu associated with the POS device. The process 520 in step 522 induces displaying of the menu. In step 524 that follows, the process 520 prompts for the user's selection. Such a selection prompt may be achieved by an exemplary message 534 (for entering a new identifier) displayed on the display panel 146. In step 526 that follows, the process 520 obtains the input from the user. The user input may be facilitated by the exemplary keypad 150. In step 530 that follows, the process 520 prompts for and obtains a merchant identifier. Prompting and obtaining of the merchant identifier from the user may be facilitated by a message 536. In step 532 that follows, the process 520 uses the obtained identifier to induce receiving and loading of a configuration associated with the identifier. The loading of the configuration may be visually confirmed to the user by an exemplary message 540. (See paragraph [0162]).

In contrast to the claimed invention of amended independent claims 1, 9, and 17, *Goeller* does not disclose or suggest the use of “a plurality of user selectable identifiers associated with the merchant, wherein each of the plurality of user selectable identifiers is assigned to at least

one selected type of check transaction and wherein each of the plurality of user selectable identifiers is predefined by the merchant prior to electronically processing the check". Further, *Goeller* does not disclose or suggest the element of amended independent claim 27, "wherein each of the plurality of user selectable identifiers is predefined by the merchant prior to electronically processing the payment" or the amended independent claim 37, "wherein the identifier is predefined by the merchant prior to processing the payment". While *Goeller* relates to automatically or manually selecting one of three service options such as Conversion Only, Verification with Conversion, and Guarantee with Conversion, which the present final Office Action indicates, none of these service options are predefined by the merchant prior to electronically processing a payment or check, nor are these identifiers associated with the merchant since all three service options appear to be universally offered regardless of any merchant. See paragraphs [0039] to [0040]. The universal service options of *Goeller* appear to be defined by a check or payment processor, not the merchant, and do not appear to relate to any selected type of check transaction, but rather appear to relate to whether a merchant decides to route a particular transaction to a Point of Sale Check Service for processing or not. *Id.*

For at least the reasons provided above, amended independent claims 1, 9, 17, 27, and 37 should be allowable over the cited reference.

Dependent claims 2-8, 10-16, 18-26, 28-36, and 38-45 are ultimately dependent from at least one of the amended independent claims 1, 9, 17, 27, and 37, for which arguments of patentability have been provided above. If the base independent claims are allowable over the cited reference, the corresponding dependent claims should also be in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

It is not believed that extensions of time or fees for addition of claims are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a), and any fee required therefore (including fees for net addition of claims) is hereby authorized to be charged to Deposit Account No. 19-5029.

Respectfully submitted,

/Christopher J. Chan/
Christopher J. Chan
Attorney for the Assignee
Reg. No. 44,070

DATE: 7 JANUARY 2009

SUTHERLAND ASBILL & BRENNAN LLP
999 Peachtree Street NE
Atlanta, Georgia 30309-3996
Telephone: (404) 853-8049
Facsimile: (404) 853-8806
(First Data 047000US)

Attorney Docket No.: **34250-1102**